DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 016 SO 034 323

AUTHOR	Hoge, John Douglas
TITLE	Core Values and Morality Perspectives in Contemporary American Society: An Educator's Point of View.
PUB DATE	2001-07-00
NOTE	46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Korean Moral Education Association (Seoul, Korea, July 2001).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Ethical Instruction; *Free Enterprise System; *Moral Values; *Religion; *Student Development
IDENTIFIERS	Character Development; *Character Education; Georgia; Mandatory Programs

ABSTRACT

The perspective taken in this paper is that of a person (now an educator) born in the United States in 1947 who did not experience any forms of deprivation, overt discrimination, or doubt about the future while growing up in the Midwest. The paper discusses two books which identified values which are at the core of U.S. society: "The Morality of Democratic Citizenship" (R. F. Butts, 1988) and "Principles and Practices of Education for Democratic Citizenship" (Bahmueller and Patrick, Eds., 1999). It discusses the Character Education Law which passed the Georgia legislature in 1997, explaining that the law mandated local school districts to develop and implement a program for grade levels K-12, focused on student development of character traits, such as: courage, patriotism, citizenship, honesty, fairness, respect for others, kindness, cooperation, self-respect, self-control, courtesy, compassion, tolerance, diligence, generosity, punctuality, cleanliness, cheerfulness, school pride, respect for the environment, respect for the creator, patience, creativity, sportsmanship, loyalty, perseverance, and virtue. The paper notes similarities and differences between state-mandated Georgia character education program and the core values identified in the books of Butts and Bahmueller and Patrick. It examines three factors that influence U.S. perspectives on matters of morality: the arguably positive influences of religion and universal education, and the role of free enterprise commercialism. Includes 16 notes. Contains 56 references. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Core Values and Morality Perspectives in Contemporary American Society: An Educator's Point of View

by

John Douglas Hoge
Associate Professor
Social Science Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602-7014
706-542-4416
jhoge@coe.uga.edu

ED 473 016

"Democracy must do battle on two fronts: On the one, it risks reappearing as an ideology in the service of the most powerful; on the other, its name is threatened with exploitation by an arbitrary and repressive regime. My goal…[is] to promote the rebirth of democratic convictions by combating both [of] these threats."
Alan Touraine *What Is Democracy?* *(1998)*

SO 034 323

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Korean Moral Education Association
Seoul, Korea
July, 2001

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. D. Hoge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

I would like to begin this paper by openly recognizing the many individuals who have contributed to its development. First, of course, I am deeply indebted to the many teachers and professors who helped form my own sense of morality and helped me to see the importance of this aspect of social education as a means of personal fulfillment and, importantly, as an essential ingredient to the development and maintenance of a healthy democratic society. Much of my thinking is based on the ideas and ideals these teachers and professors shared with me. Of course, I also necessarily and gladly recognize the nurturance and support that I've received from my past and present families since these fundamental units of socialization play such important roles in our own initial moral development and in our subsequent implementation of the ideals that we have been taught as we nurture our own children's lives.

This essay is written, of course, by an educator, not a politician nor a businessman. Educators are concerned more with the dispensation and development of knowledge than with the maintenance of governing power or the accrual of wealth as the primary objectives of daily life. However, it is not my intention to devalue, discount, or demean these other perspectives since we know that they--like education--play critically important roles in the maintenance and advancement of society. I must point out, however, that neither government nor business could long exist without the substantial prior work of education.

The perspective taken in this paper is necessarily that of a person born in the United States in the mid 20th century--1947 to be exact. This fact alone, in and of itself,

has immense implications, of course, for what I am capable of writing about the core values and morality focus of this paper. This era has been a period of global ascendancy for the United States, militarily, economically, and culturally. This condition has doubtlessly affected my worldview in many positive and negative ways. Further, given the regional, religious, and ethnic diversity of the contemporary United States, it is also essential to declare that I was largely raised in the Midwest, experienced affiliations with three Protestant religions, and, in so far as my ancestry is traceable, came from a Scotch-Irish heritage. These facts are revealed not only to show a frame of reference for my comments, but also to establish the fact that I did not experience any forms of deprivation, overt discrimination, or doubt about the future as I grew up[1]. Since these conditions still haunt many tens of millions of people around the world--and, indeed, hundreds of thousands of my fellow US citizens--I can only hope that the views I express here represent a legitimate perspective for their lives, too (Macedo, 2000). Finally, and I think importantly, there may be some unique aspects to my life that directed me toward my career as a social studies educator who is primarily concerned with the citizenship formation influences of that school curriculum (e.g., Leming, 1996; Mann & Patrick, 2000; Noddings, 1992; Osterman, 2000, Parker, 1996; Saye & Hoge, 1999) . I refer to my early overseas living experiences first in Havana, Cuba directly prior to Fidel Castro's Communist takeover (circa 1957) and then later, my living and schooling experiences in Bogotá, Colombia (circa 1960). These international living experiences deeply interested me in the observation and study of society. They also drove home to me, quite dramatically, a deep appreciation for the freedoms and associated benefits of my United States citizenship. I have always felt extremely

privileged to be a 20th and 21st century United States citizen. My love of the U.S.A., however, has never been blindly assumed. I believe, as do many of my fellow citizens, that our experiment in self governance by its conception and design is necessarily ongoing; that our full potential for good as a society will always be something that we strive to achieve--not a result nor something will naturally happen without conscious and continuing attention. These realizations serve to induce a strong sense of humility and an awareness of the very real potential for fallibility. They also point out the critical importance of each generation's education for the substantial and sometimes burdensome responsibilities of citizen membership in a modern liberal democratic nation-state.

The Core Values of American Society

In his book, *The Morality of Democratic Citizenship,* Butts (1988) identified twelve values that he felt lay at the core of our society. These values were largely derived from the political documents that served to define the nature of our democratic government and the rights and responsibilities of our citizens. The values were divided into *pluribus values,* or values that affirm our essential diversity, and *unum values,* or values that help our society stay together and function as a single political entity. The *pluribus values* are: freedom, diversity, privacy, due process, property, and human rights. The *unum values* are: justice, equality, authority, participation, truth, and patriotism. Butts appropriately points out that each of these values exists in degree and application at some ideal level and, importantly, that these very same values may be taken to extremes where they manifest themselves as a corrupted version of the ideal. Two

examples will serve to illustrate this point, one taken from the *pluribus values* and one from the *unum values*.

Our essential freedoms (a *pluribus value*), for example, must be exercised within established yet continually tested limits. To go very far beyond these limits invites the beginnings of anarchy--a corrupted form of freedom. A current example of our contested, evolving conception of our freedoms centers around our national debate over campaign finance reform, where we, as a society, have attempted to define appropriate limits for the role of what is termed "soft money" contributions to issues and parties (but not individual candidates) within our political campaigns. The Supreme Court has ruled that such "soft money" contributions are a form of free speech and, as such, cannot be restricted. However, it seems clear that the role of what is often termed "big money" in our political process has indeed altered the form, substance, and outcomes of our national policy debates. Consequently it must be asked whether this particular extension of our freedom of speech rights pushes us beyond the ideal of widespread, relatively egalitarian, citizen influence over matters of governance and delivers us into a new era of political tyranny where the super wealthy few battle for huge amounts of personal influence on government through the expenditure of large "soft money" contributions? On the one hand it seems clear that this wealth-based manifestation[2] of our free speech rights immensely advantages these wealthy few over others; on the other hand limiting any individual's right to spend his or her money as he or she wants in the cause of political party or issue oriented advocacy seems patently undemocratic and, therefore, entirely reprehensible. This debate has raged for some time now and it seems likely that we may reach some form of compromise in the near future[3]. Other

than the reality of that eventual and seemingly likely compromise, stands, quite importantly, the capacity of our society for this debate, a capacity that is doubtlessly tied to our form of government, the free press, and an educated citizenry[4].

For the second example, taken from the *unum values,* our complex and critically important conceptions of justice (i.e., the complex set of legislation and case-based decisions that defines appropriate implementations of distributive, procedural, and retributive justice) may become corrupted into a simple "law and order" mentality where issues of fairness, right and wrong, and, most importantly, an opportunity to think about and examine the nature of a particular application of the law as it presently exists, is officially blocked, tacitly forfeited, or even popularly thought to be inappropriate. As a concrete example that is directly related to our recent November, 2000 presidential election, imagine the ire of many registered voters who were denied access to the ballot box because they failed to appear on their precinct's voter rolls due to a computer error. In some cases election officials did the right thing and allowed the citizens to vote, but in other cases citizens were denied the right to vote despite having their voter registration cards and other required forms of identification[5]. To the officials who denied registered voters access to the ballot box, the letter of the law transcended its intent.

Butts undoubtedly believes, as do I, that the thoughtless implementation of laws becomes a form of tyranny that devalues the bonds of our voluntarily embraced contract of citizenship and ultimately demeans the essence of our humanity. This paper could go on to further explain Butts' analysis of the twelve core values he selected--along with his conceptions of the corrupted manifestations of each. However, it is more important to establish other prominent perspectives on the core values of contemporary American

society and to leave this section with an important understanding that even the most desirable ideals of democracy can be carried to undesirable extremes. As we examine other scholars' conceptions of key democratic values it will serve us well to remain conscious of the need for a thoughtful and uncorrupted implementation of our ideals.

John Patrick in his book, *Principles and Practices of Education for Democratic Citizenship* (Bahmueller & Patrick, 1999), identified a list of concepts that form the substance of democracy. Patrick asserts that these concepts lie at the very heart of education for democratic citizenship and it is clear from his exposition that these concepts are thought to be desirable means and ends of citizenship in a democratic society. As such, many of Patrick's concepts qualify as core values of our contemporary democracy and should be included and examined here[6]. Importantly, Patrick's list reaches substantial accord with the decalogue of core values identified by Butts. However, Patrick's core concepts for democratic education extend Freeman Butts' work and therefore have particular relevance to the present paper.

Patrick stresses the importance that Americans place on "minimal democracy," noting the failures and deficiencies of ancient democracy, namely its "proclivity for disruptive factional conflict, majoritarian tyranny, excessive claims on the individual..., disregard of personal or private rights, and inept administration of government" (Bahmueller & Patrick, 1999 p. 4). Patrick states that contemporary democracies should be characterized by a limited constitutional authority that is empowered by a broad based consent to exercise that authority, which in turn, is based on virtually universal eligibility to vote in elections that are "free, open, regular, fair, and contested" (p. 5). This condition is necessary to the maintenance of a government that is limited in

its powers, supportive of democratic procedures in elections and decision making, and dedicated to achieving shared community purposes. Put more directly, Americans seek local, state, and federal governments that are mindful of their limited statutory powers, respectful of citizens' rights, subject to the collective will of the citizenry, and efficiently run without corruption or excess. Such governments function to serve the common good without excessively infringing upon the freedoms we enjoy as individuals. Patrick refers to this as one of the ongoing tensions of a constitutional liberal democracy, setting the "latitude and limits of personal choice" versus the interests of the common good. Other tensions are between (a) liberty and equality, (b) liberty and order, and (c) majority and minority rights. These "ongoing tensions" are related, of course, to our attainment of a "civil society" which Patrick defines as a free and open social system that promotes freedom of association, assembly, and social choice as well as equality of opportunity in education and the economy[7].

Later in his chapter on core concepts for democratic citizenship education, Patrick identifies a list of "virtues and dispositions" he considers to be key to this effort. The list is composed of seven elements, and I will reproduce it verbatim here:

1. Promoting the general welfare or common good of the community;
2. Recognizing the equal moral worth and dignity of each person;
3. Respecting and protecting rights possessed equally by each person;
4. Participating responsibly and effective in political and civic life;
5. Taking responsibility for government by consent of the governed;
6. Becoming a self-governing person by practicing civic virtues; and
7. Supporting and maintaining democratic principles and practices.

Patrick refers to the items in the above list as "traits of character" that are necessary to the preservation and improvement of a constitutional liberal democracy. He states, "If citizens would enjoy the privileges and rights of their [democratic] polity, they must take responsibility for them, which requires a certain measure of civic virtue." In addition, Patrick identifies self-discipline, civility, honesty, trust, courage, compassion, tolerance, and respect for the dignity of all individuals as "indispensable to the proper functioning of civil society and constitutional democracy" (p. 35).

Bahmueller and Patrick's book presents evidence that modern liberal democracy has dramatically changed the world. Patrick notes that more than 115 nations in various parts of the world now meet the minimal standards for being considered democracies. He states that "before the 1970s less than 40 countries met this minimal standard of democracy, and before 1945, the number was less than twenty" (p. 6). Bahmueller asserts that there are profound effects of this global move toward democracy. He believes that "the values of democracy [have] become a vehicle for articulating and channeling" human longings. He further states that liberty has promoted the rise of free markets and made it virtually impossible to sustain authoritarian systems of government. The ideas of liberal democracy have played a key role in ending colonialism, elevating the status of the individual, promoting individual merit over inherited status, and establishing an unquestionable entitlement to basic human rights. Bahmueller also points out that science, one of the great engines of human progress, is inherently democratic in that its products and methods are necessarily open and subject to public scrutiny. He notes that "...democracy is predicated on open discussion, unimpeded inquiry, experimentalism, and a search for

truth based on evidence" and because of this a democratic culture "emphasizes both creativity and responsiveness to people's wants" (p. 96).

It should be noted that both of the above perspectives are primarily academic in nature. That is, they have been produced by scholars who were centrally concerned with presenting an analysis of the core values that were evident in the official documents and occasional writings people who influenced the structure of our government and helped lay the foundational bedrock of our freedoms. Other scholars report essentially the same perspectives (e.g., Masaro, 1993; McDonnell, Timpane, & Benjamine, 2000; Soder, 1996; Touraine, 1998). In order to present a more contemporary and political view of our core values it is instructive to examine the values that were mandated for the education of all citizens within the state of Georgia, which is, of course, my home state.

The Character Education law that I will review passed the Georgia legislature in 1997. It mandated that local school districts develop and implement a program for grade levels K-12 that would "focus on the students' development of the following character traits: courage, patriotism, citizenship, honesty, fairness, respect for others, kindness, cooperation, self-respect, self-control, courtesy, compassion, tolerance, diligence, generosity, punctuality, cleanliness, cheerfulness, school pride, respect for the environment, respect for the creator, patience, creativity, sportsmanship, loyalty, perseverance, and virtue. The 1999 legislature later added that "By the start of the 1999-2000 school year, the comprehensive character education program developed by the State Board of Education must address methods of discouraging bullying and violent acts against fellow students."

It is interesting to note some of the apparent similarities and differences between the state mandated Georgia character education program and the core values identified by Butts (1988) and Bahmueller & Patrick (1999). The major similarities include the focus on fairness/justice, patriotism, citizenship, respect for others, tolerance, honesty, and self-control. The value of citizenship in the state of Georgia list doubtlessly includes the importance of participation and the full exercise of our freedoms, foundational values and key virtues to both Butts (1988) and Bahmueller & Patrick (1999). Added into the mix of virtues for Georgia citizens are quite a few character traits that might be thought less important to a democracy, namely such personal virtues as cleanliness, cheerfulness, patience, creativity, generosity, punctuality, sportsmanship, and school loyalty. These values are correlated, to a degree, with the realization of a "civil society" which may be loosely translated to mean a society where graciousness and consideration are manifested in citizen-to-citizen interactions as a universal standard. The Georgia Legislature's 1999 addition to the Georgia Character Education Act curriculum reinforces the idea of the need for a civil society further in that it explicitly prohibits "bullying and acts of violence against fellow students," which, doubtlessly, was a reaction to shootings in middle class suburban middle and high schools.

It is instructive to examine the degree to which the core values of a contemporary liberal democracy must be supported by the establishment of a civil society evidenced by the pervasive, widespread influence of good personal character traits such as those included in the Georgia Character Education Act. For example, it could be asked to what degree cheerfulness is necessary for the establishment and maintenance of a civil democratic society? Or, whether there is a necessary relationship between cleanliness

and democracy. More seriously, what is the relationship between the level of civility within a society and its ability to function well as a liberal democracy? Clearly, all forms of government benefit equally from the establishment and maintenance of acceptable levels of cleanliness among persons and places because such practices reduce the obvious threats that the lack of cleanliness has to public health and welfare. However, I see no reason to expect that the people of a democracy would demand more or less of this trait than those who function under other forms of government. It seems equally clear that a democracy might well benefit more than other forms of government from citizens who were especially oriented toward fairness/justice, truth/honesty, tolerance, and courage. Chu (1996) maintains that democracies also require citizens who are fully capable of autonomous moral decision-making and he has developed a theoretically grounded approach to achieve this goal. Clearly then, democracies must place greater emphasis on achieving some of these core values while not neglecting the others that may be more universally applicable to the maintenance of civil society under any form of government. We are therefore challenged, it seems, to do more rather than less in the area of values education. Additionally, it seems to be obviously true that some of the most important values for democratic citizenship, for example, manifesting the courage to criticize or sharply question powerful government authorities, may indeed run counter to the maintenance of a tranquil and civil society[8]. Clearly, the contemporary liberal democracy has a substantial influence on Americans' thinking about their rights of citizenship, the role of government, and the morality of everyday events in their lives (Neimi & Junn, 1998; Vontz, Metcalf, & Patrick, 2000).

Having reviewed several conceptions of the core values of America's contemporary liberal democracy, I would like to turn now to examine what I believe are three factors that dramatically influence our collective perspectives on matters of morality. I will first address the arguably positive influences of religion and universal education, assessing these primarily from my own personal experiences. Next I will examine the role of free enterprise commercialism—especially as it is manifested in the world of advertising.

The Positive Effects of Religion on Contemporary Americans' Morality

Religion, as it is manifested largely in various Christian denominations, has a substantial influence on the common American's sense of morality. According to the US Census Bureau, almost two thirds of America's 284 million citizens are members of a church or synagogue. Of this group, approximately 55% are members of the various protestant denominations, 28% are Catholic, 2% Jewish, and 6% other religions. The US Census reports that there are approximately 330,000 churches, synagogues and places of worship representing 77 distinct religious bodies in the United States with a membership of approximately 168 million. This explains why international visitors are often impressed with the fact that communities across America are dotted with churches, both large and small, rich and poor, fundamentalist and those that abstractly interpret the religious texts that they use.

Because of our religious diversity it is quite hard to generalize about the specific teachings and morality perspectives of our religious communities (Bach & Modl, 1989). In addition, it must be recognized that even within the same denomination significant

differences will exist from church to church. For example, a Presbyterian congregation on one side of town may receive a substantially different treatment of religious topics than a congregation on the other side of town. Diversity exists among the different Protestant denominations and even among the Catholic churches that exist within a community.

The presence of such a great diversity of religions in America does not dilute the influence of religion when it comes to values and morality. This has been demonstrated by The Virtues Project, started in 1991 by Linda and Dan Popov. They researched all of the world's major religions for their common moral threads or virtues[9] and arrived at a set of fifty-two virtues that all held in common. The virtues are: assertiveness, faithfulness, kindness, respect, caring, flexibility, love, responsibility, cleanliness, forgiveness, loyalty, reverence, compassion, friendliness, mercy, self-discipline, confidence, generosity, moderation, service, consideration, gentleness, modesty, steadfastness, courage, helpfulness, obedience, tact, courtesy, honesty, orderliness, thankfulness, creativity, honor, patience, tolerance, detachment, humility, peacefulness, trust, determination, idealism, prayerfulness, trustworthiness, enthusiasm, joyfulness, purposefulness, truthfulness, excellence, justice, reliability, and unity. An analysis of this list shows that some of the religion-based virtues are the same as those Bahmueller & Patrick (1999) and Butts (1988) identified as being necessary to democratic citizenship (e.g., honesty/truth; participation/service; tolerance/diversity; generosity/helpfulness/general welfare). The fact that these ideals of conduct exist within secular society independent of any authoritative scriptural mandate may reflect the influence of religion on our civil society or it may indicate the complete

independence of these values from any scriptural source (Cozic, 1995). The match exists but it cannot be easily explained. It is also clear that many of these religion-based values match the list promoted by the state of Georgia's Character Education Act curriculum. For example, the values of courage/steadfastness; honesty; kindness; cleanliness; self-control/self-discipline; courtesy; compassion; tolerance; diligence/determination; generosity; respect for the creator/prayerfulness/humility appear in both sets. An extension exists, however, into additional, explicitly religious values such as faithfulness, forgiveness, mercy, modesty, steadfastness, thankfulness, and prayerfulness[10].

My focus now turns to how such commonly held religious values influence the morality of our shared public lives. Clearly there have been attempts to legislate religion-based morality perspectives[11], ranging from outlawing the Mormon's original practice of polygamy, to the passage of prohibition, to the once widespread use of 'blue laws' that forced the closing of businesses on Sundays, to opposition to legalized abortion, to the US Supreme Court decisions that effectively eliminated teacher-led and organized prayer in public schools. Religious orientations have also dramatically affected the viability of political office candidates and office holders, at one time threatening the chances of John F. Kennedy's Presidential candidacy due to his Catholic faith, and more recently influencing, perhaps, the outcome of the Bush-Gore election due to Joe Lieberman's substantial public profile as an American of Jewish faith. Simply put, in America it is advantageous for political office candidates and elected officials to be members of the dominant religions and to practice their faiths in ways that demonstrate their adherence to those particular religious values. Indeed, the

religious right in the United States is well organized and actively promotes candidates who favor its legislative and social agendas. Candidates who favor legalized gambling, support abortion rights, agree with the Supreme Court's ban on organized school prayer, or favor extending the benefits of marriage to same-sex partners receive substantial scorn from the pulpits of many religious right oriented churches and they encounter stiff opposition from these church members at the ballot box. One cannot conclude, however, that the strength of the religious right influences all people of faith in the United States. There are many churches that refrain from directing their congregations in political matters, leaving decisions regarding political candidates and most political issues up to the individual church member's conscience.

Religion has many additional influences on public life (Cozic, 1995). In our public schools, for example, it is now common for all major religious faiths to have their specific religious holidays recognized as legitimately excused absences from class. Further, it is common practice to allow parents' religion-based preferences to influence the provision of instruction in topics and programs such as sex education, driver's education, dance instruction, physical education, and even participation in the Pledge of Allegiance. Religion in America has also supported, historically among the Catholic faith, but more recently also among Protestant denominations, the provision of faith-based private schooling that runs from preschool through college. Faith-based private schools often implement an explicit strand of instruction in their particular religion and restrict the curriculum in ways that constrain students' exposure to unwanted topics that are sometimes included in the public schools.

In addition to religion's influence on education, in many lines of business it is financially prudent to be a member of a large congregation. This may be true for a variety of jobs from running a local automotive repair shop to selling insurance or delivering babies. Prominence within a large congregation helps bring in business because it is believed that the bonds of trust born through shared faith help ensure fair treatment and excellent service. Of course the expectation of favored treatment at the hands of a same-faith businessperson runs counter to other moral and perhaps legal dictates not to mention the potential for decreased sales that might come to a business whose favoritism was publicly exposed.

We would do well to recall that religion has many positive outcomes for our society. Importantly, it serves to regulate conduct—much of it moral conduct—in ways that are closely tied to scripture and various consensus interpretations of that scripture. Religion can be used to teach love, tolerance, devotion to family, and many other values such as those identified by the Virtues Project. Unfortunately, religion can also be used to teach hatred and intolerance. Indeed it has historically served as the basis for inter-group conflicts in many regions of the world.

There is little doubt that America's constitutionally codified policy of religious freedom has played a major role in helping regulate and quell interfaith conflict. Morality in America is not simply based on religion. More accurately, it is based on a confluence of moral ideals based in many religions and the adoption of these ideals as a secular basis for many of our laws. The operation of religious freedom within our democracy has promoted the acceptance of religious tolerance. The separation of church and state

in a multi-faith liberal democracy appears to be an essential step in guaranteeing domestic tranquility.

The Positive Effects of Education on Contemporary Americans' Morality

Education is supposed to influence the development of the whole child, fostering healthy growth of the rational intellect, the sentiments, and the body. Students gain knowledge, skills, and values as a result of their mandatory 12 years of schooling. Knowledge includes facts, concepts, main ideas, generalizations, scientific laws, and theories. Skills include learned intellectual routines and physical capabilities that meld thought with psychomotor performances. Values include the acquisition of concepts of the ideal and desirable, pro-social attitudes, and the eventual manifestation of moral and ethical character traits. The schooling process is supposed to help produce, with the assistance of families and other community institutions, (1) a person who is capable of being self-sufficient and (2) a person who willingly contributes to his or her community. The K-12 schooling activities of the 50 individual states are largely independent of federally mandated testing and curriculum standards and the efforts that states put into schooling account for the largest part of their annual budget expenditures. Schooling in the United States is largely public, with approximately 90 percent of all Americans being educated in tax supported public schools. These schools vary widely in their settings and climates, from small rural schoolhouses to sparkling suburban campuses to inner city schools located in the population centers our nation. About half of all Americans continue on to some form of post-secondary

education. About 85% finish high school. About 25% complete a four-year college degree (source NCES, 2001).

It is widely held that there is a moral dimension to schooling that is represented in the entire culture of the learning community (Goodlad, 1979, 1984). This is so because even the choice of what content to study represents a value judgment on the part of curriculum designers and teachers. Further, the ways in which content is implemented, for example by providing lessons that require extreme competition or alternatively, cooperative learning techniques, makes a statement about what is valued in society (Print & Smith, 2000). Schooling takes place within the confines of a building or campus that also sends messages about the values we embrace, from demands for orderliness such as walking on the proper side of the hallway, to the need for frugality in the conservation of school books and other resources, to the development of school spirit and competitiveness in the sports program. Teachers play key roles in the promotion of fairness, honesty, and civility. They also model in their personal conduct a wide range of desirable values such as wisdom, modesty, cleanliness, and perseverance. They promote, to varying degrees, a variety of "democratic values" such as free speech, opportunities for meaningful group decision-making, and the open analysis of school and classroom problems.

Within the school curriculum English and social studies contain the greatest opportunities for the development of ethics and morality. English typically engages students in considering the ethical and moral actions of the characters of stories and novels. The analysis is conducted primarily for the purpose of literary analysis and not

explicitly for the development of students' own morality or development of their moral decision making capacity.

Social studies on the other hand, naturally and explicitly addresses issues of ethics and morality through the content of all of the social sciences and humanities that it includes. The goal of this focus is the development of good citizens (Schneider, et. al. 1994), which importantly includes exercising the rights and obligations associated with membership in a liberal democratic community. All areas of the social studies necessarily address, to varying degrees, matters of morality and ethics because the study of people is the central focus.

Importantly, the question arises whether the social studies teacher is prepared and empowered to implement his or her lessons with this focus on core values and morality or whether the content is presented more as factual material to be mastered without regard to the ethical and moral decisions of the actors who lived that experience. Curriculum theories and research across a broad span of time and content supports the view that school based learning—especially within the social studies—should be more like the former than the latter. Namely, social studies should be, as the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) has proclaimed: meaningful, integrative, value-based, challenging, and active. (Schneider, D. et. al. 1994). Its purpose should be citizenship education, especially noting concern for the common good, and citizen participation in public life. Further, effective social studies programs must prepare young people to "identify, understand, and work to solve the problems facing our divers nation in an increasingly interdependent world" (Schneider, D., et. al. P. 159).

Within social studies there has been a vigorous law-related education curriculum initiative since the mid to late 1960s. This movement has effectively promoted citizenship education and it has also promoted the critical analysis of citizenship values that are naturally embedded in the law. The law-related education movement has steadily grown in size and recently become more directly linked to citizenship education for our liberal democracy—largely through the curriculum development efforts of the Center for Civic Education (www.civiced.org) and the Constitutional Rights Foundation (www.crf-usa.org/). The many programs and curriculum materials of the Center for Civic Education, and the Constitutional Rights Foundation have contributed substantially to the present-day citizenship emphasis of social studies in the United States. Importantly, students involved in law-related education curriculum materials and programs exercised critical thinking skills concerning key citizenship issues and values. Beyond this significant development in citizenship education, there are two additional and recent trends within the social studies curriculum that represent a particular focus on ethics and morality: character education and issues focused instruction.

Character education has received substantial national support, with a federal grant program supporting its implementation in the 50 states. Character education with its explicit focus on the development of desirable personal traits—often considered these traits without explicit links to functioning as a citizen within a democratic society.

The literature on the contemporary character education movement is voluminous and still growing. Character education is seen by some as a whole school phenomenon (Kohn, 1997a, 1997b) best left to the implicit messages that are conveyed by a just and caring school community. Others see it as a separate curriculum strand added to the

present mix of subjects, perhaps as an opening message for the day. Advocates for the renewed emphasis on character education such as Wynne (1986, 1988, 1997), Likona (1988, 1991, 1993, 1997) Benninga (1988, 1997, 1998), and Bennett (1993) strongly stress the role of values inculcation, relying on the use of literature, moral maxims, pledges, a virtue-of-the-week, award ceremonies, and other forms for the direct teaching of desired traits. Recent research on moral storytelling (Kim, 2001; Leming, 2000) has offered some support for the effectiveness of these approaches to the acquisition of values. However, meta-analysis research reviews by Leming, (199X) have noted the general lack of effectiveness of these approaches.

Importantly for this paper, much of the character education effort has been substantially focused on the individual and the individual's responsibility for his or her own moral and ethical behavior. Purple (1997) has roundly criticized the movement for this characteristic and its lack of any focus on the role of society in people's moral and ethical development. Additionally, there is a substantial gap between the typical focus of character education and the recommended values education goals of citizenship educators—who tend to favor a deeper and more critical analysis of a selected set of values/morals/ethics along with substantial thinking skills development. The issues analysis trend in social studies aptly addresses the latter goal.

Issues-focused social studies draws its origins from the much earlier works on clarifying public controversy (Newmann & Oliver, 1970), inquiry-based social studies (Massialas & Cox, 1974) and values analysis (Hunt & Metcalf, 1968). Issues-focused social studies has largely been promoted within the community of social studies professionals and is most recently represented by the publication of NCSS Bulletin #93

Handbook on Teaching Social Issues (Evans & Saxe, 1996). Issues –focused social studies better emulates the real-world learning tasks of citizens and it most certainly mimics the processes of problem solving and policy making used by business and government. It does not, however, lend itself to coverage oriented teaching and testing and for this reason alone has struggled for acceptance in the substantially ossified school curriculum. Interestingly, issues-focused social studies has explicit theoretical and conceptual links to the functioning of citizens in an open democratic society, but lacks a focus on the development of personal ethics and morality. In essence, students engaged in issues-focused social studies are led to view themselves as simple investigators of problems but not often as problem participants.

In summary, America's compulsory universal system of elementary and secondary education has, without doubt, immense positive effects on the welfare of our nation. Virtually everyone attends school until the age of 16 and approximately 85% graduate from high school. Education remains the primary means of getting ahead in our society and the opportunity for education is virtually unlimited by income, race, ethnicity, faith, gender, or any other ascribed or acquired characteristic. Importantly, we have also recently acted to extend and protect educational opportunities to students with disabilities and the children of undocumented workers. Of course, it is difficult to prove that education alone has significant positive benefits in the areas of morality, ethics, character traits, values, pro-social attitudes, and the development of moral reasoning skills. This collection of largely affective constructs is also the subject of much attention within families, churches, and non-school youth settings. In addition,

these affective constructs are subjected to the potentially positive, but more likely negative, influence of the media and our contemporary consumerist culture.

The Negative Effects of Free Enterprise and Consumerism on Morality

The operation of free enterprise commercialism, has a terrific influence on our contemporary culture. The influence of our commercialism is both positive and negative. On the positive side it has brought us, among other things, an abundant supply of relatively affordable consumer products, plentiful opportunities for well compensated employment, outlets for immense amounts of creativity and inventiveness, a high standard of living for the vast majority of our citizens, and a substantial and enduring influence in global commerce and world culture. On the negative side we exist in our contemporary American culture oftentimes primarily as consumers, occupying our lives with the consumption of products and services, defining ourselves by our possessions and professions, and believing that our wealth is equivalent to our individual goodness or even our value as human beings.

While free enterprise seems to be a driving force in many countries in the world, even spurring the development of democracy in many countries, there are some negative consequences to adopting this model that other countries would do well to avoid. Two examples of the influence of free enterprise serve to illustrate its negative influence on morality: the rise of advertising especially as it has been strategically employed in the marketing of tobacco products and the contemporary American approach to health care. My analysis of these areas is only lightly documented and

represents not so much a well-informed scholarly treatment of these topics as it does my own perceptions of these phenomena.

Advertising.

Advertising is everywhere in America, from our newspapers, to our televisions, to our Internet web sites. Perhaps no other area of contemporary culture in the United States has more to say about our operative (as opposed to espoused) views of morality than commercial advertising. This is so because advertising is, above all else, an expression of what is valued in America--at least in the sense that advertising represents a media-driven cultural communication that defines the potential desirable uses of personal wealth. Advertising not only shapes our material desires, it may also be viewed as a consequence of those desires. This is so because products that fail to sell will cease to be advertised and those that are desired will be diversified, differentiated one from another, and increasingly advertised in a variety of ways[12]. How, precisely, does this ubiquitous feature of our society reflect and influence our views of public morality? No better example of the power of advertising can be found than its use for promoting the sale of tobacco products.

Perhaps the strongest case against advertising comes from the American tobacco companies who for many decades trolled the depths of commercial media luring our young into their tobacco slave ships. It took an immense groundswell of public sentiment and a significant portion of many people's professional lives to accomplish our present day limitations on tobacco advertising. I would argue that the long delay in achieving these limitations on tobacco advertising (and the sale of tobacco

products to minors) was a result of (1) the mundane, everyday operation of our minimally regulated free enterprise economy that eschews government intervention into businesses; (2) the pernicious political influence of big money and soft money on our legislative bodies; and (3) our society's increasing acceptance of advertising in all formats and manifestations as a routine component of everyday life.

Alex Molnar's chapter, "Commercial Culture and the Assault on Children's Character" (Molnar, 1997) documents the *"Joe Camel"* cigarette advertising campaign of the R. J. Reynolds tobacco company that specifically targeted youth in many of its advertising venues (e.g., magazine ads, billboards, t-shirts, etc.) and, indeed, managed to influence the tobacco use controversy news stories in the popular *Weekly Reader* magazine used by millions of school children. The marketing of tobacco products to youth is reprehensible, but in a dollar driven world creating addicts is just another way to ensure corporate bottom line success. Today, despite the advertising limitations put in place by the Master Settlement Agreement, children and youth are still exposed to massive amounts of tobacco advertising, constituting 90% of all who start smoking, a rate that represents the addition of approximately 6,000 children per day who try smoking for the first time and another 3,000 who get hooked and become regular daily smokers[13].

It seems clear that advertising was serving the interest of its tobacco company clients quite well and that it has continued to reach a large number of our young, seducing them into viewing themselves as "more mature" or "rebellious" because they have managed to purchase and use tobacco products. Indeed it may be argued that attempts to control tobacco use may have contributed to its image as something of an

antisocial activity that is desired simply because of its status as a controlled substance. Of course the advertising industry played this rebellion theme over and over in its attempts to get women to smoke. Arguments for continued advertising are invariably tied to the supposed free speech rights of companies. These rights have been increasingly balanced against the clear evidence of the well documented and substantial health risks of tobacco use to smokers and those around them. Some of the questions surrounding this concern the right of an individual to engage in self injurious behavior, the right of society to control known health hazards, the rights of corporations to produce products that can be considered addicting and dangerous, and, importantly, the supposed right of the expert use of mass media to promote consumption and manipulate public opinion. The abuse of media to promote the use of a product that is detrimental to health is another clear example of an aspect of the American value of free enterprise that other countries would do well to avoid.

Health Care.

I need to declare at the outset that I believe, along with many other people, that access to health care is a human right and therefore that the provision of medicines and medical treatments is inherently a matter of morality. This is so because medicine is the application of knowledge to the alleviation of human suffering. Where the knowledge and means exist, it is a matter of moral imperative to provide treatments without regard to a person's social status or ability to pay because people with similar conditions suffer equally regardless of their personal history, present status, or future potential. Whether or how much a person can pay should have no bearing on his or her treatment[14].

However, recent reforms in health care have presented challenges to the right to health care and have made health care a big business. Nowhere are these reforms more evident than in the area of what has now become known as "managed care." Health care reforms and managed care have dramatically altered Americans' access to medical treatments and an examination of managed care illustrates the impact of the insertion of bottom line business mentalities into modern medicine in the United States.

As recently as the 1950s and 60s, health care in America was largely a matter of the practice of medicine by individual physicians who determined their treatments and set their fees with a large degree of professional autonomy. Physicians substantially regulated their own profession, voluntarily joining the staff of hospitals, and maintaining private practices that were often rather independent of outside influences. The degree to which a physician chose to view his or her professional practice as a business was largely determined by him or her alone. Considerations of costs were matters of concern, but they typically did not drive decisions regarding the provisions of treatments nor did they dictate an efficiency or cost-benefit analysis of the individual physician's daily practice. Adjustments to fees based on a person's ability to pay were common and completely under the individual physician's prerogative. This way of providing health care has been substantially diminished with the rise in managed care, a term that describes two main types of health plans or health insurance plans: Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) and Preferred Provider Organizations (PPOs).

Managed care, of course, is not a new concept. Kaiser Permanente, the largest HMO in America, traces its history back to the 1930s. However, HMOs remained a small percentage of the market until the 1960s, when, shortly after the 1965 passage of

Medicare legislation, private attempts to contain rising healthcare costs became widespread. Medicare's cost containment measures began to be adopted by private health insurers and, in addition to effects on payments to hospitals, also began to affect how physicians practiced medicine as well. Managed care PPO plans typically sign contracts with physicians, hospitals, and other health care professionals and facilities who agree to participate in a "network" of "participating" providers who care for members of the managed care plan. Physicians were "signed" much like a baseball team would sign up players: the message was, if you wanted to play in the medicine game you had to join the team. Consumers in the plan have to agree to use only these providers and most plans require consumers to obtain preadmission authorization from a "gatekeeper" physician before seeing certain specialists or seeking certain services.

While cost containment was and still is an important objective of HMOs and PPOs, these organizations have effectively inserted a bottom line "for profit" business motive between the medical practitioner and his or her client. In addition they have inserted a huge number of additional HMO and PPO employees and business executives into the medical equation who, in the end, exercise a form of bottom line medical morality that dictates medical care decisions to patients and physicians alike. Typically, managed care organizations automatically cover only certain well-accepted and cost-effective preventative medicine treatments and pay only a certain rate for these services, a rate that is often 20% less than what most physicians traditionally charge. Patients are obligated to cover a proportional or flat rate "co-payment" that is designed to help cover the costs of the procedures but also to reduce over consumption of services--largely by the poor[15]. For expensive procedures, operations or treatments

that fall outside of the area of preventive and routine medicine, patients now have to obtain approval from the managed care organization's benefits counselors prior to taking action.

The American media is replete with stories of patients who were denied access to appropriate medical care as a result of the actions of these agents of medical cost containment. This year's Congress is once again considering the enactment of a Patient's Bill of Rights Act that seeks to ensure adequate access to health care, particularly for those covered by managed care plans. Interestingly, one web site for the Patient's Bill of Rights Act opens into a page with the title, "Patients Before Profit: The Patients Bill of Rights (www.senate.gov/~dpc/patients_rights/index.html)." Physicians, of course, have bristled under the burdens of HMOs and PPOs and deeply resented the dictates these lesser trained telephone-based claims and approval technicians. Physicians openly complain of the immense amounts of time and resources they waste on filing claims. Further, I believe, they have generally resented the entire movement toward the insertion of this bottom line business mentality into the area of modern medicine.

As a result of this movement health care is big business in America today and it is obvious that big business cares more about profit than the right to health care, a morality issue. The fact that America has a very high proportion of uninsured citizens--43.4 million Americans, 16 percent of the population, did not have insurance in 1997--demonstrates this point. And, while America spends the largest portion of its GDP on health care of any other industrialized nation, it ranks 37th among 191 countries in terms of its performance on five key health indicators: (1) overall level of population

health; (2) health inequalities (or disparities) within the population; (3) overall level of health system responsiveness (a combination of patient satisfaction and how well the system acts); (4) distribution of responsiveness within the population (how well people of varying economic status find that they are served by the health system); and (5) the distribution of the health system's financial burden within the population (who pays the costs)" (World Health Organization, 1999). Furthermore, managed care has not eliminated some of the worst features of the health care system, discrimination based on race, class, and gender. Until manage care begins to provide equitable coverage for all Americans, it will continue to stand as an icon of the pernicious operation of business thinking and greed within this important and highly moral sphere of society. Adoption of such a business mentality around health care would be a dangerous act for others countries.

Implications for Korea and Other Nations

When I was invited to speak at this conference, there was a request that I draw implications about which American values might be adopted by other nations. I believe that the core values of liberal democracy as listed by Butts (1988) and Bahmueller and Patrick (1999) could be adopted by any nation in the world as worthy values with, of course, some attention given to fitting them with the culture of a particular society. Importantly, all nations must be vigilant in guarding against the corrupted versions of these values, a conception of excesses most ably explained by Butts (1988).

I would like to diverge now in closing to a few remarks about those contemporary influences on American morality that I believe hold potentially damaging outcomes for all of humanity and as a result would not be worthy of emulation by any other nation.

I believe there are aspects and consequences of our free enterprise system that threaten morality, specifically, (1) the overuse of advertising in the mass media to promote consumption and manipulate public opinion, (2) the invasion, in all areas of life, of a bottom-line mentality that places the accrual of wealth over other important outcomes of life, and (3) the excessive power and privilege of big money in politics and big business in the government.

The overuse of advertising

Over the period of my 54 year lifetime I have witnessed the growth of advertising from its largely conservative and essentially unobtrusive existence in newspapers and AM radio of the 1950s to its dominating presence today in commercial television, magazines, and the Internet. Simply put, the amount and level of commercial advertising intrusion into the media is excessive and obnoxious to many Americans who recall the much more modest presence of advertising in the past. It is sad to witness the general public's and especially children's passive acceptance of this massive level of advertising as a normal condition of life. Ads, of course, are designed to get our attention, so they flash on the screen, make loud noises, and attempt all manner of verbal, written, and visual effects to get us to buy and then buy more. Infomercials, half-hour long commercials that supposedly provide in-depth information about new products, and 24 hour shopping channels have become recent additions to the regular

and highly redundant 30 second commercial spots that plague 20 to 30 minutes or more for every hour of viewing on all commercial television shows. The reality is that all broadcasters seek to maximize their commercial revenues by charging advertisers as much as possible and then airing as many commercials as the viewers will tolerate. The limits to this are, I suppose, defined by what people will tolerate as a maximum level of commercial intrusion into the "feature" that ostensibly attracted the viewer in the first place. Commercial creep—the gradual and incessant up-tick of time devoted to advertising—is unabated in our society and I see no end to it at present for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the expectation that such excessive commercialism is simply normal or at least necessary in order for broadcasters and their investors to make their fortunes. Americans clearly understand the grip of such bottom line mentality. They are also coming to tolerated the excessive power and privilege of big money and big business in politics and government.

The invasion of bottom-line mentality.

It seems clear to me that America is in the midst of a business-driven bottom line frenzy that is increasingly occupying all aspects of people's lives. People are obsessed with the rise and fall of stock prices, interest rates, the value of the dollar, the price of gold, and the future value of agricultural commodities and mineral resources. Stock and money trading is a major national industry that is highly volatile and tied to the nanosecond technologies of communications and computers. People are elated when they feel rich; they are deflated when they feel poor.

In the lifestyle that we currently embrace, the American emphasis on individualism crosses, perhaps too well, with our wealth oriented definition of success. As a result, our individual welfare is seen to be much more of a function of our prowess as independent wage earners and savvy investors than it does upon our reliance on the fact of our citizenship, membership in social or religious groups, or even our immediate or extended families. Recent years have called into question the viability of Social Security, have witnessed the revision of welfare, and have seen the modification of many other aspects of what is often termed "the safety net," a group of services provided at free or reduced cost to citizens in need. In short, we have abandoned, more than ever, our collective bonds and cast our fates as individuals in very complex world where trends, though somewhat apprehensible, are often beyond our control yet linked to our desired individualist lifetime goals.

Young Americans report that their top priority in life is individual success in a career so that they can have financial security, be happy and healthy, have a good time, and take care of themselves. Much less importance is given to involvement in their communities, being politically active and voting, or being American citizens who care about the good of the country (National Association of Secretaries of State, 1999) Most want to make a lot of money and think that doing so will solve the other problems they experience such as loneliness, low self-concept, or limited sense of membership in their society. I fear that our current concern in character education is an attempt to fix or prevent problems such as disrespect for authority, the rise of school violence, and cheating in order to get ahead than it is a sincere attempt to build morally sound Americans who care deeply about their communities and all of their fellow citizens.

Sadly, our concern is much more clearly focused on the morality and character deficits of individuals than it is on securing a stronger sense of community (Etizioni, 1993; Purple, 1996). Osterman's (2000) recent review of research on students' need for belongingness in a school community clearly documents its importance and concludes that schools, especially secondary schools, often adopt organizational and curriculum practices that diminish students' sense of acceptance and membership. Noddings (1992, 199x) has also contributed significantly to our awareness of the need to establish caring school communities.

The excessive power and privilege of big money.

At the founding of our nation Americans were substantially disenchanted with the powers and pretensions of English Royalty. We, therefore specifically disavowed the powers and privileges that came with royalty and royal blood kinship.

While we still, over 225 years later, do not have an official king or queen, we now have "kings" and "queens" of commerce whose financial success has awarded special status in access to justice, political power, and the operation of government at local, state, and national levels. The growth of extreme personal wealth among a very small percentage of our citizens is the leading story of the 20th century in that this accumulation of wealth is closely tied to all aspects of America's success[16].

I believe that most Americans are ambivalent in their reactions to such individuals. On the one hand they often admire the displays of wealth and power while at the same time they experience resentment and envy. However, they appreciate the employment opportunities that are often attributed to the entrepreneurial endeavors of

these people. Americans would not deny them their wealth or many of the things that their wealth can purchase. But I believe they do resent these individuals when it is clear that their money is being used to tip the scales of justice, dramatically influence the political process, and manipulate the operation of government. We have substantial evidence of all of these effects, so the question becomes one of the degree of these abuses and the willingness of the American public to tolerate these practices.

Of course, a key factor in determining the outcome of these trends is the potency of the civic education received by Americans (Bahmueller, 1995; Patrick, 1998, 2000). It is interesting to note that despite initial neglect of the importance of citizenship education in much of the reform movement, the rise of democracies around the world has now put America's civic education practices in a stronger spotlight (Patrick, 1997). Should we reverse our trends in ignorance and apathy toward politics and government, should we suddenly awaken from our excessive individualism and begin to find a greater sense of satisfaction in cultivating our shared sense of community, then we may achieve higher ideals in our collective endeavors than the simple accumulation of individual power and wealth. This awakening, in my opinion, could be spurred by a stronger emphasis on civic education that includes the development of character. Perhaps then the generation of a greater sense of community will provide the public mindedness needed to reduce the excessive use of advertising, soften the bottom-line mentality that puts human life in peril, and reclaim the essential equality we embraced at the founding of our nation.

References

Bach, J. S. & Modl, T. (1989). *Religion in America: Opposing viewpoints.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.

Bahmueller, C. F. & Patrick, J. J. (Eds.). (1999). *Principles and practices of education for democratic citizenship: International perspectives and projects.* Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Bahmueller, C. F. (1995). *National standards for civics and government.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-95-3. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Benninga, J. S.; Wynne, E. A. (1998). Keeping in character: A time-tested solution. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79* (6) 439-45,448.

Butts, R. F. (1988). The morality of democratic citizenship. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.

Butts, R. F. (1989). *The civic mission in educational reform: Perspectives for the public and the profession.* Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Cho, H. (2001). Traditional way of life in East Asia. *Korea Focus on Current Topics, 9*(1), 135-146.

Chu, B. W. The proper aim of moral education in a democratic society: A synthesis of moral socialization and moral development. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, XX, XXX.

Cozic, C. P. (Ed.) (1995). *American values: Opposing viewpoints.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.

Engle, S. H. & Ochoa, A. S. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Evans, R. W. & Saxe, D. W. (Eds.). (1996). *Handbook on teaching social issues.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Goodlad, J. I. (1979). What schools are for. Bloomington, IN.: Phi Delta Kappa

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York, NY.: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1996). Democracy, education, and community. In R. Soder (Ed.) *Democracy, education, and the schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic education: With a new preface and epilogue.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Han, M. G. (2001). Role of education in national unification. *Korea Focus on Current Topics, 9*(2), 133-146.

Hoge, J. D. (1978). *An analysis of the values content of Florida state-adopted elementary social studies textbooks and the curriculum guidelines of the national council for the social studies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Hunt, M. P. & Metcalf, L. E. (1968). *Teaching high school social studies. Problems in reflective thinking and social understanding.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Jeong, H. (2000). Information society and democracy in Korea. *Korea Focus on Current Topics, 8*(5), 68-75.

Kaufman, P., Kwon, J.Y., Klein, S., Chapman, C.D. (2000). *Dropout rates in the United States: 1999* (NCES 2001-022). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics

Kirschenbaum, H. (1995). *100 ways to enhance values and morality in schools and youth settings.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Leming, R. S. (1996). *We the people…. The citizen and the constitution.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-96-4. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Macedo, S. (2000). *Diversity and distrust: Civic education in a multicultural democracy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mann, S. & Patrick, J. J. (Eds.). (2000). *Education for civic engagement in democracy. Service learning and other promising practices.* Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Massaro, T. M. (1993). *Constitutional literacy. A core curriculum for a multicultural nation.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

McDonnell, L. M.; Timpane, P. M.; & Benjamin, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Rediscovering the democratic purposes of education.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

McKinney, J. P. (1980). Moral development and the concept of values. In M. Windmiller, N. Lambert, & E. Turiel, (Eds.). *Moral development and socialization.* (pp. 201-218). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Milson, A. J. (1999). *The perceptions of social studies teacher educators regarding character education.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, XX, XXX.

Molnar, A. (Ed.). (1997). *The construction of children's character.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Nash, R. J. (1997). *Answering the "virtuecrats." A moral conversation on character education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

National Association of Secretaries of State (1999).

Newmann, F. M. & Oliver, D. W. (1970). *Clarifying public controversy: An approach to teaching social studies.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company.

Niemi, R. G. & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research 70*(3), 323-367.

Otten, E. H. (2000). *Character education.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-1999-6. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Parker, W. C. (1996). Curriculum for democracy. In R. Soder (Ed.) *Democracy, education, and the schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patrick, J. J. (1995). *Civic education for constitutional democracy: An international perspective.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-95-8. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Patrick, J. J. (1997). *Teaching about democratic constitutionalism.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-97-2. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Patrick, J. J. (1999). *The concept of citizenship in education for democracy.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-1999-6. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Patrick, J. J. (2000). Multicultural education and the civic mission of schools. In W. G. Wraga & P. S. Hlebowitish (Eds.). *Research review for school leaders.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Patrick, J. J. (2000). *The national assessment of educational progress in civics.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-2000-1. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Patrick, J. J. (1997). *Global trends in civic education for democracy.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-97-1. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Patrick, J. J. (1998). *Education for engagement in civil society and government.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-98-8. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Print, M. & Smith, A. (2000). Teaching civic education for a civil, democratic society in the Asian region. *Asia Pacific Education Review 1*(1), 101-109.

Saye, J. W. & Hoge, J. D. (1999). Citizenship projects. In J. A. Braun, Jr. & C. F. Risinger, (Eds.) *Surfing social studies: The Internet book.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Schneider, D.; Adler, S. A.; Beery, R.; Ladson-Billings, G.; Fernekes, W. R.; Hartoonian, H. M.; McFarland, M. A.; Marker, G.; Montgomery, M. A.; Nickell, P.; & Tevis, C. (1994). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Soder, R. (1996). Teaching the teacher of the people. In R. Soder (Ed.) *Democracy, education, and the schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Torney-Purta, J.; Amadeo, J. & Lehmann, R. (2001). *Civic knowledge and engagement at age 14 in 28 countries: Results from the IEA civic education study.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-2001-3. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Torney-Purta, J.; Schwille, J.; & Amadeo, J. (1999). *The IEA civic education study: Expectations and achievements of students in thirty countries.* ERIC Digest EDO-SO-1999-10. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Touraine, A. (1998). *What is democracy?* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

VanSickle, R. L. (1983). Practicing what we teach: Promoting democratic experiences in the classroom. In M. A. Hepburn, (Ed.). *Democratic education in schools and classrooms.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. (pp. 49-66).

Vontz, T. S.; Metcalf, K. K.; & Patrick, J. J. (2000). *Project citizen and the civic development of adolescent students in Indiana, Latvia, and Lithuania.* Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Wynne, E. A.. (1988). Balancing character development and academics in the elementary school. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(6) 424-26.

Wynne, E. A.; Walberg, H. J. (1986). The complementary goals of character development and academic excellence. *Educational Leadership, 43* (4) 15-18.

Wynne, Edward A. (1982). Rigorous thinking about character. *Phi Delta Kappan, 64* (3) 187-88.

Endnotes

[1] The one exception to this statement was the fear of global nuclear war that we experienced in the 50s, 60s 70s and 80s. This fear was associated, of course, with highly negative propagandistic notions about a number of nations and a strong embrace of capitalism (also known as free enterprise) and democracy as superior systems of commerce and government compared to a centralized command economy and either socialism or communism as forms of government.

[2] Of course the wealthy, like the well educated, have always had a proportionally greater influence over party politics and government policy. The contemporary situation is exacerbated by the new mass communication technologies which allow, at a very high price, access to virtually all citizens through a variety of communication mediums.

[3] As I write this the Senate is slated to take up debate on the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill that recently passed in the House of Representatives. Many political observers believe that some form of meaningful and constitutional reform will be enacted.

[4] This last element--the educated citizenry--is clearly the lesser, but not the least important of the three elements. Unfortunately, to be educated in America implies much more about one's technical, employment related knowledge than it does about any sense of philosophy or rich knowledge of and commitment to our government and political structures. Further, there are, indeed , modern political science theories that recognize the political disengagement (though not formal disenfranchisement) of the majority and assert that this does no harm to the policy making apparatus of government or its perceived legitimacy.

[5] The American Civil Liberties Union and several other organizations filed a federal court lawsuit on January 10, 2001 as a result of the Florida election troubles. The suit alleges, among other things, that "disparate and unfair voting practices across the state resulted in the invalidation of a disproportionate number of ballots cast by black voters for President, the wrongful purge of black voters from official voter lists, a failure to properly process registrations of black voters, and the establishment of unjustifiable barriers to black voters."

[6] Patrick's list is substantial, consisting of seven main categories with up to six subcategories. His analysis of these concepts occupies 60 pages.

[7] These goals, of course, have historically been denied to many groups within American society. The 20th Century has witnessed a considerable expansion of these goals, however.

[8] Tranquility and civility, of course, are not the same. Tranquility can exist within any form of society and so can civility. Civility may certainly aid the development of tranquility since the opposite of civility results often in conflict. Tranquility may exist however, without civility.

[9] Different authors refer to conceptions of ideal behavior or existence with different words (McKenney, 1980). I tend to prefer to use the word values, a term that does not necessarily equate such conceptions of the ideal with personal character traits nor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

necessarily identify them as virtues. To illustrate my point of view, I ask the reader to consider the desirability of experiencing a responsible sexual relationship with another person. This is clearly a life goal and an ideal, but I doubt that it could be called either a virtue or a character trait. My point is that we can conceive of many ideals, only a few of which may be legitimately thought of as character traits and fewer still as virtues.

[10] I recognize that all of these values, with the possible exception of prayerfulness, can and do exist as secular ideals. However their common presence in all of the major world religions clearly marks them as religious values. Finally, I was, at first puzzled by the failure of the Virtues Project to mention salvation as a key value--but realized that it is not common to all world religions. Note that there may be other religious values that do not appear in the Virtues Project list due to this same reason.

[11] Indeed, one of the recognized functions of government, beyond its first duty to promote order and safety, is the codification into law of widely held views on morality.

[12] This is not to say that advertising does not and can not cause a product to sell. Its role in this capacity is legendary. Indeed, without advertising many products would sell much less and a few, I imagine, would disappear completely.

[13] Source: Tobacco Company Marketing to Kids. Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. (www.tobaccofreekids.org)

[14] Of course the supply of medicines and treatments is limited and, because of this, some decisions need to be made regarding how those limited goods and services will be distributed. Importantly, in the present health care system in the United States, these decisions are made on the basis of a person's ability to pay.

[15] It can be argued that the co-payments did less to deter excessive use among the financially well-to-do since they were much more able to meet these nominal charges.

[16] More and more these extremely wealthy Americans are powerful actors in the commerce, social, and government affairs of other nations.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

[redacted]

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Core Values and Morality Perspectives in Contemporary American Society: An Educator's Point of View	
Author(s): John D. Hoge	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: July 2001

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: [signature]		Printed Name/Position/Title: John D. Hoge/Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: Social Science Education University of Georgia Athens, GA 30605-7014		Telephone: (706) 542-4416	FAX: (706) 542-6506
		E-Mail Address: jhoge@coe.uga.edu	Date: 10/28/02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)